REMARKS

Having carefully studied the Examiner's Response to Arguments in the final Office Action, Applicants have amended the claims in an effort to place the application in condition for allowance with only a cursory review by the Examiner, and respectfully request entry and consideration of this Amendment After Final.

Claims 45-50 are cancelled.

The Examiner's remarks suggest that the claimed means for destroying the vessel in order to open the vessel, if not indefinite, would distinguish the invention from the disclosure of Maloy under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b). Claim 32 is thus amended to more fully recite the claimed means to open the vessel "and release the substance into the reactor, the means to destroy the vessel comprising a solvent to dissolve and destroy the vessel, a rotating stirring element to impact and destroy the vessel, or mechanism to propel the vessel against the reactor to destroy the vessel."

Maloy does not disclose the structural limitations added by amendment to claim 32. Maloy discloses a container sealed with a rubber finger cot or prophylactic and a spring wire puncture bridge attached to the container. To breach the rubber finger cot/prophylactic the atmospheric pressure surrounding the sealed container is lowered causing the rubber finger cot/prophylactic to expand and contact the spring wire puncture bridge, thereby puncturing the rubber finger cot/prophylactic. The wire puncture bridge of Maloy does not destroy the vessel in order to open the vessel *and release the substance into the reactor* are recited by claim 32. Instead, Maloy's substance remains in his container and is not released into the reactor.

Amended claim 32 further recites a solvent to dissolve and destroy the vessel, a rotating stirring element to impact and destroy the vessel, or a mechanism to propel the vessel against the reactor to destroy the vessel. Malloy does not disclose or suggest these limitations of amended claim 32.

As discussed above, Maloy discloses only a wire puncture bridge, which is a fixed mechanism, for puncturing the rubber finger cot/prophylactic. This fixed mechanism of Maloy does not disclose or suggest the use of a solvent to dissolve and destroy the vessel, a rotating

stirring element to impact and destroy the vessel, or a mechanism to propel the vessel against the reactor to destroy the vessel. Further, none of these elements is equivalent to the wire puncture bridge under the standard set forth in MPEP § 2144.06 (Rev. 3, August 2005), *i.e.*, "the equivalency must be recognized in the prior art, and cannot be based on applicant's disclosure or the mere fact that the components at issue are functional or mechanical equivalents."

Because Maloy does not disclose or suggest means located within the test reactor to destroy the vessel in order to open the vessel and release the substance into the reactor, the means to destroy the vessel comprising a solvent to dissolve and destroy the vessel, a rotating stirring element to impact and destroy the vessel, or a mechanism to propel the vessel against the reactor to destroy the vessel as recited by amended claim 32, claim 32 is not anticipated by Maloy under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Dependent claims 33-44 contain features that further distinguish the claims from the disclosure of Maloy and also are not anticipated by Maloy under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

For the reasons discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen D. Scanlon

Stephen D. Scanlon Reg. No. 32,755
Jones Day
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-3939